

TOP SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOUO~~ 2006/08/28 at 09:42:29 A00010007000618 downgraded to SECRET when filled in form is detached from controlled document.

CONTROL AND COVER SHEET FOR TOP SECRET DOCUMENT

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	REGISTRY
SOURCE OCI 7F18	CIA CONTROL NO. TS # 188417/A
DOC. NO.	DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED
DOC. DATE 13 December '63	
COPY NO.	LOGGED BY
NUMBER OF PAGES 1	
NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS	

ATTENTION: This form will be placed on top of and attached to each Top Secret document received by the Central Intelligence Agency or classified Top Secret within the CIA and will remain attached to the document until such time as it is downgraded, destroyed, or transmitted outside of CIA. Access to Top Secret matter is limited to Top Secret Control personnel and those individuals whose official duties relate to the matter. Top Secret Control Officers who receive and/or release the attached Top Secret material will sign this form and indicate period of custody in the left-hand columns provided. Each individual who sees the Top Secret document will sign and indicate the date of handling in the right-hand columns.

[illegible]

NOTICE OF DETACHMENT: When this form is detached from Top Secret material it shall be completed in the appropriate spaces below and transmitted to Central Top Secret Control for record.

DOWNGRADED		DESTROYED		DISPATCHED (OUTSIDE CIA)	
TO		BY (Signature)		TO	
BY (Signature)		WITNESSED BY (Signature)		BY (Signature)	
OFFICE	DATE	OFFICE	DATE	OFFICE	DATE
Approved For Release 2000/08/29 : CIA-RDP79T00429A000100070006-6					

~~TOP~~ SECRET

13 December 1963

Comment on FBI Letter Dated November 29, 1963

We think the Bureau's evident suspicions concerning their source are well founded. The "information" in the report appears to be nothing more than speculation, based on press materials and supported by unsubstantiated "evidence."

Moscow and Peiping are locked in battle for control of the world Communist movement and there are no indications that either side intends to surrender its major positions in the struggle--something which would be required before any genuine rapprochement could take place.

From time to time, conciliatory gestures have been employed as tactics in the struggle. Khrushchev's recent call for an end to open polemics is a maneuver of this sort. Peiping's abusive rejection of this Soviet gesture is a reflection of continued Chinese intransigence concerning matters of substance in the dispute.

Tough anti-Soviet political speeches during the coming US presidential campaign might be cited by Moscow for bloc audiences as evidence that, despite Chinese charges, Khrushchev has not gone soft on capitalism or the "imperialists" would not be attacking him. They would not, however, provide Moscow with motivation for the kind of shift in policy demanded by the Chinese as a pre-requisite for resumption of Sino-Soviet relations on the old comradely basis.

We have nothing to substantiate the evidence cited to support the contention that Moscow and Peiping will move closer together during the forthcoming year. The current Sino-Soviet trade agreement was negotiated in Moscow during April and we know nothing about a recent Soviet trade delegation to Communist China, warmly received or otherwise.

As for the reported release of Soviet prisoners by the Chinese, we have no evidence that Peiping was holding any Russians and would appreciate any details if the source can be queried on this subject.

25X1A

~~TOP~~ SECRET